

REMARKS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).
The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1)
5 and MPEP § 608.01(o). Claims 1-12 are rejected.
Response to the Office Action identified above is
listed below.

1. Objection of drawings under 37CFR 1.84(p)(5):
10 A description in the specification for the
reference sign "34" is required.

Response:

15 The reference sign "34" has already described in
paragraph [0005], lines 14-17 as follow:

20 "A plurality of spacers 34 are disposed between the front
plate 14 and the rear plate 12 to maintain the fixed
spacing between the front plate 14 and the rear plate
12."

Thus, the objection is not proper and should be
withdrawn.

- 25 2. Objection of the drawings under 37CFR 1.83(a):
The showing of the electrode pairs are disposed on
a bottom surface of the front plate, also a second
dielectric layer having a second predefined pattern
disposed on a bottom surface of the front plate, a
30 fluorescent layer covering the second dielectric layer
must be shown or the features canceled from the claims.

Response:

After the claim amendment, the feature that "the electrode pairs are disposed on a bottom surface of the front plate" is changed in wording to "a plurality of electrode pairs parallel to each other and disposed over a surface of the front plate, wherein the surface of the front plate faces the rear plate" and described in claim 16. According to the property of a plasma panel being different from a plasma display panel, the plasma panel can be used for providing a light source for a display, such as, being used as a backlight in a LCD. The electrodes of a plasma panel are disposed between the rear plate and the front plate, no matter on the rear plate or on the front plate, both in the similar situation. Therefore, as the applicant has already disclosed the structures shown in Figs. 2-4, one skilled in the art can easily realize the structures when the electrodes are disposed on the front plate. Therefore, the showing of "the electrode pairs are disposed on a bottom surface of the front plate" is not required.

After claim amendment, the wordings "a second dielectric layer having a second predefined pattern disposed on a bottom surface of the front plate" and "a fluorescent layer covering the second dielectric layer" are changed to "a second dielectric layer having a second predefined pattern, sandwiched between the front plate and the second fluorescent layer", as a feature in claim 4. Therefore, a drawing, Fig. 5, is added to show the second dielectric layer on the surface of the front plate and a fluorescent layer on the second dielectric layer. Thus the objection should be overcome.

3. Objection of the specification under 37CFR
1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o):

The Examiner kindly points out the specification
5 failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
claimed subject matter and correction of the following
is required: "phosphorous layer".

The Examiner also kindly points out that the
informalities in paragraph 14, "Fig. 3is", is
10 suggested changing to "--Fig. 3 is--".

Response:

The claimed subject matter "phosphorous layer" in
claim 11 can be found in paragraph [0017] "A
15 fluorescent layer 122, usually being a phosphorous
layer, is respectively coated on a bottom surface 118
of the front plate 104, the top surface 108 of the rear
plate 102, and a surface of the dielectric layer 116."
And in paragraph [0021] "A fluorescent layer 222,
20 usually being a phosphorous layer, is coated on both
the top surface 208 of the rear plate 202 and a surface
of the dielectric layer 216." The specification does
provide proper antecedent basis for it, therefore, the
basis for the objection should not exist.

25 The informalities in paragraph [0014], "Fig. 3is",
is corrected to as "Fig. 3 is" according to the
Examiner's instruction, and in paragraph [0015], "Fig.
4is", in paragraph 16, "106.A", in paragraph [0018],
"Fig. 3is", in paragraph [0020], "Fig. 4is", are also
30 corrected. Thus, the objection is overcome.

4. Rejection of claims 1-5, 9 and 12 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amemiya et al. U.S. Patent 6,492,770 B2:

Claims 1-5, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), for reasons of record that can be found on pages 5 3-4 in the Office action, dated on April 22, 2004, identified above.

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to as follow:

10

A plasma panel comprising:
a rear plate;
a front plate parallel to and spaced apart from the rear
plate by a plurality of spacers;
15 a plurality of electrode pairs parallel to each other
and disposed over the rear plate;
a first dielectric layer having a first predefined
pattern covering the plurality of electrode pairs,
wherein a recess is formed between two adjacent
20 electrodes of the plurality of electrode pairs; and
a first fluorescent layer covering the first
dielectric layer.

The invention of the present application relates
25 to a plasma panel which is different from a plasma
display panel. The plasma panel according to the
present application comprises a plurality of spacers
which function is to space apart the front plate from
the rear plate, not to divide electrode pairs into a
30 sealed separated discharge cell, therefore, the space
between the rear plate and the front plate is not
divided into small cells by the spacers. When the
plasma panel works, all of the fluorescent layers emit
light simultaneously.

However, Amemiya et al. teach a plasma display panel comprising a partition wall to define a discharge space into each of the unit light emitting area. In view of Figs. 2 and 18 taught by Amemiya et al., the 5 plasma display panel has discharge space divided into a unit light emitting area for each electrode pair. The structure is apparently different from the plasma panel according to the present application.

Therefore, claim 1 of the present application is 10 novel over Amemiya et al., and the rejection over claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 2 is supported by original claim 2, lines 8-11 of paragraph [0016], and Figs. 2-4 (reference signs 112, 114, 212, 214).

15 Amended claim 3 is supported by lines 1-4 of paragraph [0017], and Fig. 2 (reference signs 122).

Amended claim 4 is supported by lines 16-25 of paragraph [0019].

Amended claim 5 is supported by Figs. 2-4 20 (reference signs 116, 122, 216, 222).

Amended claim 6 is supported by lines 1-8 of paragraph [0022], and Fig. 4 (reference sign 216).

Amended claim 7 is supported by lines 1-12 of paragraph [0022], and Fig. 4 (reference sign 216).

25 Amended claim 8 is supported by lines 1-4 of paragraph [0017], and Fig. 2 (reference signs 122).

Amended claim 10 is supported by lines 16-25 of paragraph [0019], lines 14-20 of paragraph [0023].

Amended claim 11, 13, and 14 are supported by lines 30 1-4 of paragraph [0017] and lines 3-6 of paragraph [0021].

Amended claim 15 is supported by original claim 9

or lines 4-6 of paragraph [0016] and lines 6-9 of paragraph [0018] or lines 8-11 of paragraph [0021].

As amended claims 2-15 are dependent upon the amended claim 1, they should be allowed if the amended
5 claim 1 is allowed.

New claim 16 is supported by lines 13-22 of paragraph [0019], or lines 10-20 of paragraph [0023]. Therefore, no new matter is introduced.

As new claim 16 is in another aspect to the present
10 application, it should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed.

4. Rejection of claims 1 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore U.S.
15 Patent 6,570,339:

Claims 1 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), for reasons of record that can be found on page 5 in the Office action identified above.

20 **Response:**

Moore teaches an array of complex shaped top fibers that each include an address electrode, barrier ribs to form a plasma channel and a phosphor coating on the plasma channel create structure in a plasma display panel. The barrier ribs are required to form separated plasma channels as taught in the specification and the drawings by Moore, different from the plasma panel according to the present application having the spacers to function as described above. Therefore, claim 1 of the present application is novel over Moore, and the rejection over claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As amended claims 2-15 are dependent upon the amended claim 1, they should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed.

As new claim 16 is in another aspect to the present 5 application, it should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed.

5. Rejection of claims 1, 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore U.S. 10 Patent Application Publication 2001/0033483:

Claims 1, 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), for reasons of record that can be found on page 6 in the Office action identified above.

15 Response:

Moore teaches using at least one array of linear glass structures that contain at least one wire electrode running the length of the glass structure to fabricate a fluorescent lamp. At least one of the 20 linear glass structures has a cross-section that forms a channel which supports a plasma gas. The array of glass structures can be composed flat to form a fluorescent lamp or in a cylindrical or conical shaped fluorescent lamp. However, Moore failed to teach an 25 element like "spacer" and the configuration "a recess is formed between two adjacent electrodes of the plurality of electrode pairs" as described in the amended claim 1 of the present application.

Therefore, claim 1 of the present application is 30 novel over Moore, and the rejection over claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As amended claims 2-15 are dependent upon the

amended claim 1, they should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed.

As new claim 16 is in another aspect to the present application, it should be allowed if the amended claim 5 1 is allowed.

6. Rejection of claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Moore U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033483 in view of 10 Chikazawa U.S. Patent 5,932,967:

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), for reasons of record that can be found on page 7 in the Office action identified above.

15 Response:

Moore teaches using at least one array of linear glass structures that contain at least one wire electrode running the length of the glass structure to fabricate a fluorescent lamp; however, claim 1 of 20 the present application is novel over Moore as the reasons described above. Although Chikazawa teaches a phosphorous layer, Moore in view of Chikazawa does not teach or suggest the element like "spacer" and the configuration "a recess is formed between two adjacent 25 electrodes of the plurality of electrode pairs" as described in the amended claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, amended claim 1 is novel and not obvious, and should be patentable. Amended claim 11 dependent upon amended claim 1 is also novel and 30 not obvious, and should be allowed.

For at least the reasons stated above, amongst other

reasons, the cited references fail to disclose the novel structures disclosed in the claimed invention. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the objection and the rejection be withdrawn and the claims 5 be placed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner does not understand or has any questions regarding the arguments above, applicants respectfully request he contact the Winston Hsu to discuss this matter in greater detail.

10

Sincerely yours,

15



Date:

JUL 21 2004

20 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

e-mail:winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

25 (Please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone communication and I will return your call promptly.)

19